

wrappers of the boxes containing the article, falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as an active blood purifier, as a remedy against all pulmonary troubles, colds, la grippe, bladder diseases, kidney diseases, as a remedy for female complaints and all chronic troubles, as a remedy against all stomach complaints, lung troubles, and constitutional weaknesses, when, in truth and in fact, it was not. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the statement, "Contains 6 Oz.," borne on the wrappers of the said boxes, was false and misleading in that it represented that each of the boxes contained 6 ounces of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, each of the said boxes did not contain 6 ounces of the article, but did contain a less amount.

On July 1, 1921, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$200 and costs.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

9592. Misbranding of "Monarch" Brand cottonseed feed. U. S. * * * v. Monarch Mills, a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100 and costs. (F. & D. No. 12346. I. S. No. 10917-r.)

On June 30, 1920, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Tennessee, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Monarch Mills, a corporation, Chattanooga, Tenn., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about April 11, 1919, from the State of Tennessee into the State of Kentucky, of a quantity of "Monarch" Brand cottonseed feed which was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it contained 18.20 per cent of protein, 24.40 per cent of crude fiber, and 2.75 per cent of ether extract (crude fat).

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Protein 20 per cent Fat $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent Fibre 22 per cent," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the said article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that the article contained not less than 20 per cent of protein, not less than $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of fat, and not more than 22 per cent of fiber, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it contained not less than 20 per cent of protein, not less than $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of fat, and not more than 22 per cent of fiber, whereas, in truth and in fact, said article did contain less protein and fat and more fiber than represented by said statement, to wit, approximately 18.20 per cent of protein and 2.7 per cent of fat, and approximately 24.40 per cent of fiber.

On November 9, 1920, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$100 and costs.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

9593. Misbranding of Texas Wonder. U. S. * * * v. 144 Bottles of Texas Wonder. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 12383. I. S. No. 9683-r. S. No. C-1916.)

On May 3, 1920, the United States attorney for the Western District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 144 bottles of Texas Wonder, at Waco, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped by E. W. Hall, St. Louis, Mo., on or about March 20, 1920, and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Texas, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.